A	ssembly Hea	ring Slip
	(please print pla	•
Da	ite: <u>2/2//0</u>	2
Bi	II No. <u>692</u>	
Or Si	whilest Securi	ty Deone
K Z	object <u>Securi</u> Rep Schn	2.1
Na	me P SEIIII	eiau
	204N	
Str	eet Address or Route Num	ber
	Capitol y, State, ZIP Code	
Cit		
Rep.	lali Addrasa	legis.
5	tate. wi. us	en V
Org	anization You Represent	
	Speaking in Favor:	
	Speaking Against:	۵
	Registering in Favor:	×
	Registering Against:	
	Speaking for Information neither for nor against:	Only,
Plea	ase promptly return the messenger at the h	
	Provided by: Assembly Sergeant at http://www.assemblyserge	Arms eant.com

Assembly Hea	aring Slip
(please print p	lainly)
Date: 1/17/02	2
Bill No. AB 690	2
Or Subject	
E. Joe Wi	orall
Name	
4801 Forest	Run Rd
Street Address or Route Nun	nber
City, State, ZIP Code	<u> 53704</u>
JWCRRAN @	WRA.ORG
Organization You Represent	s Assar.
<u> </u>	
Speaking in Favor:	۵
Speaking Against:	
Registering in Favor:	>0
Registering Against:	
Speaking for Information neither for nor against:	
Please promptly return t messenger at the l	this slip to the
Provided by: Assembly Sergeant a http://www.assemblyserg	at Arms geant.com

Assembly Hearing Slip					
(Please print plainly)					
Date: 1-17-02					
Bill No. Assembly Bill 692					
Or Subject ————————————————————————————————————					
Kathryn Schroeder Name 2306 Hoard St. #1 Street Address or Route Number					
Madisan W: 53704 City and Zip Code					
Myself					
Representing					
Speaking in favor:					
Speaking against:					
Registering in favor:					
Registering against:					
Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against:					
Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.					

	Assembly Hea	iring S	Slip
	(Please print pla	uinly)	1000
Date	: 01-17-02		
Bill N	vo. <u>692</u>		
Or Subj	ect		
15 Street A	Annie & elly McDo N. Pinckne ddress or Route Number adison, WI 5	ey Su	pus ite102
	. Association of	S.Easte Wisco	
Apt	. Association of	Colonia de Composicio de Compo	
Apt	. Association of nting	Wisco	
Apt	Association of nting Speaking in favor:	Wisco	
Apt	Association of inting Speaking in favor: Speaking against:	Wisco	

Assembly Hea	ring Slip
(Please print plai	nly)
Date:	2
Bill No. <u>692</u> A	B
Or Subject <u> </u>	4
Diane Michals	Ki Turner
3035 Dickin	50 N
Madison 53	703
City and Zip Code Women and Poverfield Sucation Full Representing	Public tietive
Speaking in favor:	
Speaking against:	☑
Registering in favor:	
Registering against:	
Speaking for information Neither for nor against:	only:
Please promptly return this messenger at the com	s slip to the mittee.
Provided by: Assembly Sergeant at Arm 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708	us

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

117/02 No. AR 692

III No. HB 692.

Megin Hicks 120 Division G

Street Address or Route Number

Representing

Speaking in favor:

Speaking against:

Registering in favor:

Registering against:

Speaking for information only:
Neither for nor against:

Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Provided by:
Assembly Sergeant at Arms
411 West, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53708

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

Date: 1-17-02

Bill No. AB 692

Or Subject See Dopera't

Subject Address or Route Nymber

Werd Address or Route Nymber

City and Zip Code

With MACH 53557

Representing

Speaking in favor:

N.

Speaking against:

Registering in favor:

O

Registering against:

Speaking for information only:

Neither for nor against:

Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Provided by:
Assembly Sergeant at Arms
411 West, State Capitol
Madison, WI 53708

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

Date:

Bill No.

Subject-

eet Address or Rour

y and Zip Code

Representing

Speaking in favor:

Speaking against:

A/

O

Registering in favor:

Registering against:

О

Speaking for information only:

Neither for nor against.

Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

			7
/17/02	692	·	A
Date:	Bill No.	Or Subject	9

Name

Street Address or Route Number

53703	
[Λ]	
adison,	7. 0
8	P. Page

City and Zip Code

The state of the s			
tepresenting	Lus -	The same	

Speaking against:

区

Speaking in favor:

Registering in favor:

Registering against:

Speaking for information only:

Neither for nor against:

Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Provided by: Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

25	269
	AB
Date:	Bill No.

I

N U MENEND 144

Subject. ō

L.A.W., 17c.

T3725-9 Street Address or Route Number 3 なるようか

C. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. ソニターム Lesal Action 1 . 1 Stite City and Zip Code

Representing

3:1

A Speaking in favor:

Speaking against:

Registering in favor: Registering against:

Speaking for information only:
Noithor for nor against: Neither for nor against: Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708 Provided by:

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

70 692 RAS S 9 Subject -Bill No. Date: Name

Street Address or Route Number

City and Zip Code

Z

Representing

ちょ 5 Speaking in favor: Speaking against:

Registering in favor:

Registering against:

Speaking for information only: Neither for nor against: Neither for nor against: Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

2	
9	
d	
1	
ate:	
ä	

Subject Sec. Dapasit refund

4914 MeDaniel Lone

Street Address or Route Number

Legislative Mctarland, WI 5355-8 City and Zip Code (いんけんしん) Wisc. Rontal Housing

Representing

Speaking in favor:

X

Speaking against:

Registering in favor:

Registering against:

Speaking for information only:
Neither for nor against: Neither for nor against: Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708 Provided by:

Assembly Hearing Slip

(Please print plainly)

Ч	
1/27/	(6)
	<u>`</u>
)ate:	N III

なるとと Subject - Rep Marlin Schneider

Street Address or Route Number

City and Zip Code

Representing

Council

/	2	,	
	follow	2	
	2.5	<u>_</u>	
	Speaking		

Speaking against:

Registering in favor:

Registering against:

Speaking for information only:
Neither for nor against: Neither for nor against: Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708 Provided by:

Sporsi Assembly Hearing Slip Rm. 17, 2002 JENNIK (Please print plainly) SECURITY 769 SIN Subject -Bill No. Date:

N. PINCKNEY ST Street Address or Route Number

DUNCIL 53703 LEGISLAL HOUSING MADISON City and Zip Code Representing

Speaking in favor:

Speaking against:

Registering in favor:

Registering against:

Neither for nor against:

Please promptly return this slip to the messenger at the committee.

Assembly Sergeant at Arms 411 West, State Capitol Madison, WI 53708 Provided by:

State of Wisconsin CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection Division of Trade and Consumer Protection



To:

Representative Tom Sykora, Chair

Assembly Committee on Housing

From:

Fran Tryon, Director, Bureau of Consumer Protection

Teel D. Haas, Assistant Legal Counsel

Subject:

AB 692 Relating to return of Security Deposits to Tenants

The Division of Trade and Consumer Protection appears before the Committee today to respectfully testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 692. AB 692 is not needed.

First, the bill proposes to change the amount of time a landlord has to return a security deposit from 21 days to 45 days. Throughout 1997-1998 the department worked with an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee that included landlords and tenants to revise ch. ATCP 134. The issue of expanding the 21-day time period to return the security deposit was never an issue on the table with the Advisory Committee. At one time there was a proposal to reduce the amount of time, but that proposal was withdrawn at the early stages of the process. The department is not aware of any need to increase the amount of time to return security deposits. The issue about security deposits that most concerned the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee was when the 21 days to return the deposit started to run. Consequently, the Ad Hoc Committee spent a substantial amount of time discussing that issue.

Second, the bill requires the landlord to include an itemized statement of what has been withheld from the security deposit. This is already required in the department's rules at ATCP 134.06(4)(a).

Third, the bill requires the department to define by rule the term "security deposit." This term is already defined by rule at ATCP 134.02(11). The department also notes that the definition of security deposit was not changed as a result of the 1999 revisions to ATCP 134.

Fourth, the bill requires the department to "specify when surrender of the premises occurs." The department's rules already define what constitutes "surrender of the premises" at ATCP 134.06(2)(b). The meaning of "surrender of the premises" was a major issue discussed at length by the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. The language in the rule reflects the Advisory Committee's extensive work and discussion on this issue.

Fifth, the bill requires the department to specify what amounts a landlord may properly withhold from a tenant's security deposit. Again, the department's rules already do this at ATCP 134.06(3). The Advisory Committee involved in revising ATCP 134 discussed this issue at length.

In summary, the department respectfully objects to AB 692 because it duplicates existing law and because it extends the time period for returning security deposits without a clear reason for doing so.



Women and Poverty Public Education Initiative (WPPEI)

303 S. Dickinson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
Telephone: 608-294-9048
E-mail: dturner@facstaff.wisc.edu

January 17, 2002

Representative Thomas Sykora, Chair Committee on Housing Wisconsin State Assembly

Dear Representative Sykora:

We, the Women and Poverty Public Education Initiative, urge the Committee on Housing to help people secure decent, affordable housing by mandating the return of security deposits to renters within 21 days. We ask the Committee to do this based on research done in Madison:

I spoke with 35 women in March 2001 at the Dane County Job Center, which is the 'Wisconsin Works' program (W-2) office, in Madison, Wisconsin. When I analyzed the women's responses to my inquiries about what were the three things that they and their families needed most, 14 women ranked housing as their top priority and housing was claimed by six individuals as their second priority need.

Affordable housing that is subsidized by the state is so limited that people fill out applications and wait for months or years. Additionally, this kind of housing is located in less safe, less desirable neighborhoods. If individuals want to reside in better neighborhoods, they often have to pay more for and pay all of their rent themselves.

One way to respond to housing problems is for families to share living space: 10 women noted that they shared accommodations; of these one woman was employed and the other nine were unemployed. Three women's housing was very tenuous – they were living in shelters.

Thank you for considering our recommendation to return security deposits within 21 to renters.

Yours truly,

Diane Michalski Turner, PhD

Nichalski Surner

Director

MY NAME IS HAL MENENDEZ. I'M A STAFF ATTORNEY WITH LEGAL ACTION OF WISCONSIN. LEGAL ACTION OF WISCONSIN PROVIDES FREE LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO LOW INCOME PERSONS AND FAMILIES IN 11 COUNTIES IN SE WISCONSIN. MUCH OF OUR WORK IS REPRESENTING TENANTS. LAW ATTORNEYS MAKE IN EXCESS OF 700 COURT APPEARANCES EACH YEAR ON BEHALF OF LOW INCOME TENANTS. I'M ALSO SPEAKING TODAY ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST LAW SECTION OF THE STATE BAR OF WISCONSIN.

WE ARE OPPOSED TO THE PASSAGE OF AB 692 BECAUSE ITS PROVISIONS

ARE LARGELY UNNECESSARY AND IT WILL CREATE CONFUSION FOR

LANDLORDS AND TENANTS, AND WILL CREATE CONFUSION FOR

(Market Harmonia) Examples of Actual Confusion for

AB 692 WOULD ADD A SECTION TO CH 704 OF THE STATUTES, REQUIRING
THAT WITHIN 45 DAYS AFTER THE SURRENDER OF THE PREMISES THE
LANDLORD RETURN THE SECURITY DEPOSIT TO THE TENANT, LESS ANY
AMOUNTS WITHHELD. IF ANY AMOUNTS ARE WITHHELD, THE LANDLORD
MUST PROVIDE A WRITTEN STATEMENT ITEMIZING THE AMOUNTS WITHHELD.
IN ADDITION, ATCP IS REQUIRED TO ADOPT RULES TO DEFINE THE TERM

SECURITY DEPOSIT, SPECIFY WHEN THE SURRENDER OF THE PREMISES

OCCURS AND THE AMOUNTS WHICH A LANDLORD MAY WITHHOLD FROM THE

SECURITY DEPOSIT.

ATCP HAS ALREADY ADOPTED A RULE THAT DEFINES SECURITY DEPOSIT,
SPECIFIES WHEN SURRENDER OCCURS AND SPECIFIES THE AMOUNTS A
LANDLORD MAY WITHHOLD FROM THE TENANT'S SECURITY DEPOSIT. THE
RULE ALSO REQUIRES THAT THE SEC DEPOSIT AND A WRITTEN ITEMIZED
STATEMENT OF THE AMOUNTS WITHHELD BE PROVIDED W/IN 21 DAYS OF
THE SURRENDER OF THE PREMISES, NOT 45 DAYS AS AB 692 PROVIDES.

THE CURRENT LAW, INCLUDING THE 21 DAY REQUIREMENT, HAS BEEN IN

EXISTENCE FOR OVER 20 YEARS. OVER TIME, THE RULE AND THE RIGHTS

AND REMEDIES OF LANDLORDS AND TENANTS UNDER THE RULE HAVE BEEN

CLARIFIED BY COURT DECISIONS AND AMENDMENTS TO THE RULE.

THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE DEPOSIT BE RETURNED WITHIN 21 DAYS HAS BEEN IN EXISTENCE SINCE THE RULE WAS ADOPTED IN 1980. THIS

REQUIREMENT IS THE PRODUCT OF NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING AND COMPROMISE. THE 21 DAY LIMIT HAS NOT BEEN A PROBLEM. AND UNTIL NOW, THERE'S BEEN NO SUGGESTION TO CHANGE IT. A FEW YEARS AGO AN AD HOC TASK FORCE THAT INCLUDED REPRESENTATIVES OF LANDLORDS AND TENANTS AGREED TO A NUMBER OF REVISIONS IN THE RULE. THE 21 DAY LIMIT FOR RETURNING SECURITY DEPOSITS WAS IDENTIFIED AS A PROBLEM AT THAT TIME, AND NO SUGGESTION WAS MADE TO CHANGE IT. THERE IS NO REASON TO CHANGE IT NOW.

IF AB 692 IS ENACTED INTO LAW, TENANTS WHO ARE ENTITLED TO A FULL REFUND OF THEIR SECURITY DEPOSIT WILL HAVE TO WAIT AS MUCH AS 45 DAYS TO RECEIVE IT. THIS WILL POSE SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR LOW INCOME TENANTS.

SECURITY DEPOSITS ARE TYPICALLY AS MUCH AS ONE MONTH'S RENT. FEW PEOPLE CAN AFFORD TO BE WITHOUT THAT MUCH MONEY FOR SUCH A LONG TIME. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TRUE FOR LAW'S LOW-INCOME CLIENTS.

AND THE FIRST MONTH'S RENT AT THE TIME THEY ENTER INTO A NEW
TENANCY. SOME MUST BORROW THE MONEY FROM FAMILY OR FRIENDS AND
NEED TO REPAY IT QUICKLY. IF THE WAIT FOR THE SEC DEPOSIT IS 45 DAYS,
FEWER RENTER FAMILIES WILL BE ABLE TO RELY ON THESE SHORT-TERM
LOANS TO TIDE THEM OVER UNTIL THE SECURITY DEPOSIT IS RETURNED.

IN SOME CASES, THE NEW LANDLORD IS WILLING TO WAIT FOR THE SECURITY DEPOSIT TO BE PAID, BUT IN THOSE CASES THE DEPOSIT MUST TYPICALLY BE PAID IN THE FIRST MONTH OF THE TENANCY. UNDER CURRENT LAW, MOST TENANTS WILL BE ABLE TO PAY THE NEW LANDLORD A SECURITY DEPOSIT BY THE END OF THE FIRST MONTH BECAUSE OF THE 21 DAY LIMIT. WITH A 45 DAY LIMIT IT WILL NOT BE POSSIBLE TO DO THIS.

THERE ARE ALSO RENTERS WHO HAVE TO DOUBLE UP WITH FRIENDS AND FAMILIES, OR LIVE ON THE VERGE OF HOMELESSNESS, OR ACTUALLY BECOME HOMELESS UNTIL THE SECURITY DEPOSIT IS RETURNED. UNDER AB 692, THE TIME THEY LIVE IN THESE UNCERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES WILL MORE

THAN DOUBLE.

THE CURRENT LAW IS FAIR AND WORKS WELL. LANDLORDS AND TENANTS

HAVE LEARNED HOW THE CURRENT SECURITY DEPOSIT LAW WORKS AND

UNDERSTAND IT. THEY KNOW THEIR RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THEY

UNDERSTAND THE ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS AND THE PENALTIES AND

REMEDIES AVAILABLE UNDER THE CURRENT LAW. AB 692 WILL ONLY RESULT

HARDSHIP FOR RENTERS AND NEEDLESS CONFUSION FOR LANDLORDS AND

TENANTS.

FOR THESE REASONS WE ASK THE COMMITTEE REJECT THIS BILL.

Wisconsin Mfd Home Owners Association, Inc http://userpages.chorus.net/wimhoa/ PO Box 254, Marshall WI 53559 608/655-4573

January 17, 2002

TO Testimony before the Legislative Housing Committee

BY Kristen Zehner, President

350,000 renters in MHPs RE AB 692

The Wisconsin Mfd Home Owners Association registers solid opposition to this bill for the following reasons:

1. Residents in land-lease communities are <u>required upfront</u> by landlords to pay their first month's rent and security deposit upon initial commitment. Renters should be afford the same privilege--their deposit money returned to them--<u>upfront</u>--and not 45 days later. Some landlords like to "forget" about returning it at all.

Changing 21 to 45 days return is an unfair burden on people with limited resources who have a significant investment in their home. Most are lucky to pay their rent monthly, so that finding a second security deposit could be next to impossible.

- 2. The power imbalance between landlords and renters is already enormous. Changing the law to 45 days return would prolong the housing limbo in which renters typically hang. The state would be abdicating its responsibility to the common good by tilting the playing field even more toward landlords.
- 3. We suggest that 5 percent interest on all security deposit monies be included in this bill. A security deposit is considered the property of the tenant. We know of no other business where one party has access to the use of free money except that currently afforded landlords.
- 4. We believe codification of security deposit language in statute is an extreme measure that does not seem warranted. Moving security deposit language into the Statutes removes what little protection or redress renters have to protect their rental rights, and it significantly increases the costs for renters in obtaining access to justice. We all know there is no justice unless one can afford it.

Whether codified or not, it should behoove the State to specify in the language that no security deposit shall exceed one and one-half month's rent, as is codified in the State of Michigan, and those monies shall be deposited in a financial institution. Landlords may then only use this money if they deposit a bond with the Secretary of State.

Security deposit monies may also only be used for:

- a. Reimbursement for actual damages not reasonably expected in the normal course of habitation.
- b. Pay for rent in arrearage, rent due for premature termination of a rental agreement, and for utility bills not paid by the renter.
- c. The landlord must then complete a termination inventory checklist of all damages he/she claims were caused by the tenant.
- d. In case of damages, the landlord must mail to the tenant an itemized list of charges within 14 days.
- 5. No reference is made in this bill to what constitutes a "late fee" versus a "penalty." Penalties ought to apply only when a landlord loses money, and it should be always be in proportion to any money a landlord has actually lost. <u>Currently</u>. Wisconsin makes no provision for what would be reasonable late fees, versus punitive penalties charged by community park landlords. Park landlords also like to penalize any renter who has Section 8 monies; this should be declared illegal.
- 6. This bill makes access to justice for renters more arduous and impractical than it already is. It would seem prudent that the Legislature support economic justice for the common good, rather than codify for the few legal benefits they don't need.